

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-10, 19-35, 38-76 and 112-116 are pending. Claims 11-18, 36, and 37 were withdrawn in response to a previous restriction requirement and for possible rejoinder upon the indication of allowable subject matter for their respective independent claims. Claims 77-111 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Telephone Interview and Interview Summary

The Applicant's representative notes with appreciation the telephone interviews with Examiner Hamilton on July 29, 2009 and August 4, 2009. During the interviews, arguments were presented and discussed in reference to the cited prior art.

Specifically, the Applicant's representative discussed the obviousness rejections in the final office action based on the cited references, York US 5,926,392 ("York") in view of Geer US 5,930,778 ("Geer"). The Applicant's representative discussed, *inter alia*, Geer's failure to teach or suggest extracting or obtaining information from images of a check and/or invoice, as generally recited in the claimed invention. Furthermore, the Applicant's representative identified exemplary specification recitations of extracting or obtaining information from images, such as paragraphs [0042], [0061]-[0063], and [0065]-[0070] of pre-grant publication number 2003/0009420.

Examiner Hamilton agreed that the claimed invention is distinguishable over the prior art of record, and thus, overcomes the current obviousness rejections in the final Office action.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-10, 19-35, 38-76, and 112-116 Based on York in view of Geer and Norris

In the May 27, 2009 final Office Action, claims 1-6, 25-32, 34-35, 38-48, 71-76, and 115-116 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over York US 5,926,392 ("York") in view of Geer US 5,930,778 ("Geer"). Claims 7-10, 19-24, 33, 49-70, and 112-114 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over York and Geer as applied to claims 1 and 48 above, and in further view of Norris US 6,105,007 ("Norris"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above in the Interview Summary, Applicant submits that York, Geer, Norris, or any combination thereof, does not , and cannot, disclose or suggest independent claims 1, 48, and 74-76, or their respective dependent claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-10, 19-35, 38-76 and 112-116 should be withdrawn, and the claims should be placed in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that claims 1-10, 19-35, 38-76 and 112-116 are in condition for allowance and action toward that is respectfully requested. If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 425-8552.

* * * * *

It is believed that no additional fees are due; however, should any additional fees be required or credits be due (except for payment of the issue fee), the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from or credit the overpayments to Nixon Peabody Deposit Account No. 50-4181, Order No. 247171-000290USPT.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 11, 2009

/Peter J. Prommer – Reg. No. 54743/
Peter J. Prommer
NIXON PEABODY LLP
300 S. Riverside Plaza, 16th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6613
(312) 425-3900 – main
(312) 425-3909 – facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT